<u>REMARKS</u>

By the present amendment Claims 1 and 9 have been amended and Claim 6 has been cancelled. Claims 1-5 and 7-10 remain in the application, with Claim 1 being independent and Claim 7 being multiply dependent.

The Examiner indicated that Claim 6 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By the present amendment Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 6, thus Claim 1, and the claims which depend therefrom, are allowable.

The Examiner further indicated Claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, relating to the recitation of a broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation. Claim 9 has been amended to remove the "preferably" language and thus this rejection is believed to be overcome.

The Examiner had rejected Claims 1-5, 7-8, and 10, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wells* in view of *Kennedy*. Given the incorporation of the limitations of Claim 6 into Claim 1, which the Examiner indicated would result in allowable subject matter, it is believed that the rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-8, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on *Wells* in view of *Kennedy* is overcome and, thus all the claims presently in the application are allowable.

Applicants' attorney respectfully submits that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests such allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS

May 29, 2003 Date

Randall L. Shoomaker, Registration No. 43,118

Howard and Howard Attorneys, P.C. The Pinehurst Office Center, Suite 101

39400 Woodward Ave.

Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304-5151

(248) 723-0425